

on the sports ticker that runs at the bottom of CNN's Headline News, that network has a special responsibility to show how the lives of many students are being ruined by the compulsion its ticker helps feed. A "Gambling is for suckers" crawl among the scores would do for starters.

Will the polls sense the coming voter revulsion at the "painless" revenue source that failed? Representative Frank Wolf of Virginia has introduced a bill to establish a "National Gambling Impact and Policy Commission"; let's see if the casino lobby can buy the votes to avert scrutiny and resigmatizing.

The yen to gamble is a personal weakness, but state-sponsored gambling is a banana-republic abomination that undermines national values. My gratitude goes to that tough teacher at Joan of Arc who stopped me before I started.

OPPOSITION TO THE WELFARE BILLS IS GROWING

• Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, as there will be no rollcall votes in the Senate today, some Senators are away and may have missed the open letter to the President from Marian Wright Edelman, entitled "Say No to This Welfare 'Reform,'" in this morning's Washington Post. She writes:

As President, you have the opportunity and personal responsibility to protect children from unjust policies. It would be a great moral and practical wrong for you to sign any welfare "reform" bill that will push millions of already poor children and families deeper into poverty, as both the Senate and House welfare bills will do. It would be wrong to destroy the 60-year-old guaranteed safety net for children, women and poor families, as both the Senate and House welfare bills will do.

An accompanying Post editorial makes a further point about the Senate welfare bill:

Now here is the part you need especially to know: *Mr. Clinton's own advisers have told him that it would likely consign as many as a million more children to poverty, and it would provide several billions less for child care than his own proposal of a year ago.* [Their italic.]

Mr. President, something important is happening here. There is a growing recognition that the Senate made a terrible mistake 6 weeks ago. We voted 87 to 12 to repeal title IV-A of the Social Security Act—with almost no understanding of what the consequences might be.

Fortunately, the hard evidence has begun to come out. I only hope it is in time. Last Friday, the Los Angeles Times ran a front-page story about a September 14 report prepared by the Department of Health and Human Services. The report, which has yet to be officially released, concludes that the Senate bill would plunge 1,100,000 dependent children into poverty, and would also significantly deepen the poverty of children who are already living below the poverty line. I had the report made a part of the RECORD on November 1, and I hope every Senator will read it carefully.

Another analysis will become available in official form early next week. The Office of Management and Budget—

in response to a request from this Senator along with Representative SAM GIBBONS and 10 other members of the conference committee on welfare—will release a report on Monday or Tuesday on the effects of the Senate and House bills on children. I fully expect that this new analysis will confirm what the earlier estimates indicated: either bill would be Armageddon for children.

Over the years Congress may have missed opportunities to help dependent children, but never in our history have we calculatedly set out to injure them. The administration's own analysis shows that this is precisely what will occur under either bill now before the conference.

Mr. President, I ask that the open letter to the President from Marian Wright Edelman and the editorial from today's Washington Post be printed in the RECORD.

The material follows:

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 3, 1995]

SAY NO TO THIS WELFARE REFORM
(By Marian Wright Edelman)

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT

I am calling for your unwavering moral leadership for children and opposition to Senate and House welfare and Medicaid block grants, which will make more children poor and sick.

As president, you have the opportunity and personal responsibility to protect children from unjust policies. It would be a great moral and practical wrong for you to sign any welfare "reform" bill that will push millions of already poor children and families deeper into poverty, as both the Senate and House welfare bills will do. It would be wrong to destroy the 60-year-old guaranteed safety net for children, women and poor families as both the Senate and House welfare bills will do.

It would be wrong to leave millions of voteless, voiceless children to the vagaries of 50 state bureaucracies and politics, as both the Senate and House bills will do. It would be wrong to strip children of or weaken current ensured help for their daily survival and during economic recessions and natural disasters, as both the Senate and House bills will do. It would be wrong to exacerbate rather than alleviate the current shameful and epidemic child poverty that no decent, rich nation should tolerate for even one child.

Both the Senate and House welfare bills are morally and practically indefensible. Rather than solve widespread child deprivation, they simply shift the burden onto states and localities with far fewer federal resources, weakened state maintenance of effort and little or no state accountability. As you well know, these block grants are not designed primarily to help children or to make families more self-sufficient. They are Trojan Horses for massive budget cuts and for imposing an ideological agenda that says that government assistance for the poor and children should be dismantled and cut while government assistance for wealthy individuals and corporations should be maintained and even increased. Do you think the Old Testament prophets Isaiah, Micah and Amos—or Jesus Christ—would support such policies?

Neither the Senate nor House welfare bill is an example of the good competing with the perfect. Both are fatally flawed, callous, anti-child assaults. Both bills eviscerate the

moral compact between the nation and its children and its poor.

If child investments are unfairly and indiscriminately cut by many billions of dollars, there is perhaps some prospect of recouping the money over time when new child suffering becomes apparent, as it did after the Reagan cuts and as it will this time as pending cuts are many times worse. *But longer-term and perhaps irreparable damage will be inflicted on children if you permit to be destroyed the fundamental moral principle that an American child, regardless of the state or parents the child chanced to draw, is entitled to protection of last resort by his or her national government. If any piece of the framework or cornerstone of the laws—AFDC, Medicaid, family and child nutrition—is dismantled, we may not get them back in our lifetime or our children's.*

What a tragic step backward for America when so many children already are left behind. Both you and I know that there are lessons from American history, including the end of Reconstruction, when the immoral abandonment of structures of law and equity led to decades of setbacks for powerless Americans and battles we still are fighting today. What a tragic irony it would be for this regressive attack on children and the poor to occur on your watch. For me, this is a defining moral litmus test for your presidency.

We cannot heal our racial divisions or prepare our nation for the future unless we give poor black, brown and white children a healthy and fair start in life. These pending block grants will make that task so much harder. Together with the proposed tax policies, they widen the income gulf between America's haves and have-nots. You have spoken too eloquently and worked too long for children to wipe it out with your signature now.

It is nonsense for congressional leaders to argue that they are protecting children from a future debt children did not create by destroying the vital laws and investments children need to live, learn and grow today. That is the domestic equivalent of bombing Vietnamese villages in order to save them. It is moral hypocrisy for our nation to slash income, health and nutrition assistance for poor children while leaving untouched hundreds of billions in corporate welfare, giving new tax breaks of over \$200 billion for non-needy citizens, and giving the Pentagon almost \$7 billion it did not request.

The Children's Defense Fund wants welfare reform. But we want fair reform that does not pick on and hurt children and that provides parents jobs and safe child care. We want reform that prepares our children for the new millennium—not reform that pushes them back to past inequities within and among states.

We want to "end welfare as we know it." But we do not want to replace it with welfare as we do not want to know it. We do not want to codify a policy of national child abandonment.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt correctly said: "Better the occasional faults of a government that lives in a spirit of charity than the constant omissions of a government frozen in the ice of its own indifference." Every president since FDR—Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, Johnson, Nixon, Ford, Carter, Reagan and Bush—preserved the minimal national guarantee of income assistance for poor children. It is a precedent I hope and trust you will uphold. What was right and compassionate in FDR's day is right today and will be right tomorrow.

There is an even higher precedent that we profess to follow in our Judeo-Christian nation. The Old Testament prophets and the New Testament Messiah made plain God's mandate to protect the poor and the weak

and the young. The Senate and House welfare bills do not meet this test.

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 3, 1995]

THE WELFARE FADE

Now President Clinton has walked away from the welfare bill he sent to Congress last year, just as the week before he renounced the tax increase he pushed to passage in 1993. What next? Perhaps he'll say he didn't mean to send up last year's health care reform proposals either. Mrs. Clinton made him do it. It becomes increasingly difficult to know what this president stands for, or whether he stands for anything.

Mr. Clinton telephoned the columnist and author Ben Wattenberg last week. Mr. Wattenberg is a conservative Democrat who thinks the party has drifted too far from majority values to which it ought to return. Among much else, he thought the welfare plan the president submitted last summer was too weak—and guess what? The president agreed with him. Mr. Wattenberg wrote in a column that Mr. Clinton told him, "I wasn't pleased with it either."

The White House went to its familiar battle stations. The president, after all, wouldn't want the many people in and out of the administration who helped formulate the plan, to say nothing of the many in Congress whom he had urged to support it, to think he was abandoning them. His spokespeople therefore once again had to scurry to explain what it was that he had really meant. What he had really meant was that the budget made him do it, his press secretary said. For lack of child-care money, he hadn't been able to draw up a plan to force as many mothers off the rolls as he would have liked. But that's not what really happened. It's a misleading and self-serving, not to say self-deluding, account of the history of this bill, as fictional as was the president's account of the history of the tax increase.

Campaigning in 1992, Mr. Clinton suggested that he would force people off the welfare rolls after two years; that was the top of the message, which people heard. It was followed by all kinds of footnotes saying he would force them off only under certain conditions. The government, as part of the process of moving them off the rolls, would offer increased support in the form of training, an extension of their Medicaid, child care—even a job itself, if necessary. The families would be off "welfare," but government spending on their behalf would meanwhile go up, not down. That's how it has to be, of course, but in the campaign, that not-so-popular part of the message was played down. One still could have hoped and even believed he meant it, of course.

In office, the task of marrying the slogan to the footnotes fell mainly to the Department of Health and Human Services. The secretary hired some of the best people in the country to do the work. They did it well. Last summer the president loved it, or seemed to. "If we do the things we propose in this welfare reform program, even by the most conservative estimates, these changes together will move one million adults who would otherwise be on welfare into work or off welfare altogether by the year 2000," he said in announcing its submission.

But the president's plan was swept aside by Republican and other congressional conservatives who pocketed his proposal for time-limited welfare and went beyond it. Mr. Clinton started and in a sense legitimized a process that he then lacked the votes and stature to stop. No action was taken on welfare last year; this year, with Republicans in command of both houses, the House and Senate have passed much tougher bills than Mr. Clinton proposed.

Both are bad by the standards the president enunciated last year. They are punitive, would pull the federal floor out from under welfare, could lead to the breakup of the food stamp program as well, and would likely end up stranding some of the most vulnerable people in the society. Most of those are children. The president has nonetheless climbed aboard and said he would sign the Senate version. Now here is the part you need especially to know: *Mr. Clinton's own advisers have told him that it would likely consign as many as a million more children to poverty, and it would provide several billions less for child care than his own proposal of a year ago.* But, well, it's better than the House bill, and surely you couldn't ask a president who promised to end welfare as we know it to begin the election year by vetoing a welfare reform bill that he himself did so much to beget.

Mr. Clinton could have fought for the right result on welfare. He knows the issues by heart; he has the power; and when he still had the courage to voice them, he had the better arguments. What he has done instead is acquiesce for political reasons in the wrong result—and then give false reasons for the acquiescence. He thinks he gains by such behavior, but he diminishes himself. ●

FLAG-DESECRATION AMENDMENT COULD MAKE MATTERS FAR WORSE

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, George Anastaplo, who teaches law at the Loyola University of Chicago, is a long-time battler for first amendment rights. Recently, he had an item in the Chicago Sun-Times about the flag amendment to the Constitution that we will be confronting before too long.

One of the points he mentions is that the amendment in the Constitution would elevate the flag above the Constitution. It does strike me as ironic that flag desecration would be enshrined in the Constitution, while if you burn the Constitution, nothing happens. Should we then have another amendment for that? And perhaps another amendment for anyone who would burn the Bible? Where does this stop?

I also have noted flags made into shirts and even pants. I confess, I find this offensive, but I don't think we need to amend the Constitution because of offensive conduct.

I ask that the George Anastaplo item be printed in the RECORD.

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, Sept. 11, 1995]

FLAG-DESECRATION AMENDMENT COULD MAKE MATTERS FAR WORSE

(By George Anastaplo)

The occasional flag-burning display permitted during the last decade by the U.S. Supreme Court is generally offensive. But the proposed constitutional amendment authorizing the government to punish physical abuse or desecration of the flag may make matters far worse, however patriotic the motives of the amendment's sponsors.

One implication of such an amendment is that all other forms of desecration in this country would be thereafter considered beyond government supervision. Also, the flag would be elevated above the Constitution, even though that document alone is granted special status in the Constitution. (Every federal and state officer of government in

this country is required to take an oath to support the Constitution of the United States.)

A likely effect of legislation grounded in the proposed flag-desecration amendment would be to increase the number of publicized flag-burnings in this country. Those impassioned flag-burners who want to provoke the authorities to act against them are protected, and in effect discouraged, these days by Supreme Court rulings.

Routine abuses of the flag will continue, no matter what the Constitution and laws happen to say. Most of these abuses, keyed to commercial exploitation, have always been ignored by a public that is aroused only by those abuses that take the form of hostile flag burnings. Highly selective official enforcement of flag-desecration laws, even if a constitutional amendment should be ratified, would continue to raise First Amendment issues.

The proposed flag-desecration amendment is but the latest of a series of exercises in constitutional frivolity that have diverted recent Congresses. ●

OUTREACH TO THE SMALL AND DISADVANTAGED BUSINESS COMMUNITY

● Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. Mr. President, on September 21, 1995, I hosted a procurement fair, along with the Congressional Black Caucus Foundation, that I hope will help open up the economic activities of the Federal Government and private sector to small and disadvantaged businesses and entrepreneurs. I was extremely pleased to see nearly 80 Federal agencies and private corporations participate as exhibitors in the fair, providing hundreds of small business owners an opportunity to understand the rules governing Federal and private contracting, as well as how and where to look for contracting opportunities. This fair, modeled on an old-fashioned trade fair, will help bridge the gap that has existed between the small and disadvantaged business community and key procurement staff within the government and private sector.

The Department of Health and Human Services was one of many Federal agencies who shared important procurement information at the fair. I thank them for their participation and commend the Department of Health and Human Services on their active efforts to reach out to small, disadvantaged, and women-owned businesses.

Mr. President, I ask that the full text of remarks by Mr. John Callahan, Assistant Secretary for Management and Budget at the Department of Health and Human Services, be printed in the RECORD.

The text follows:

STATEMENT OF JOHN J. CALLAHAN

Honored Participants and Members of the Caucus:

Good Morning, I am John J. Callahan, Assistant Secretary for Management and Budget and Chief Financial Officer for the Department of Health and Human Services. I bring you greetings and well wishes from Secretary Shalala and Deputy Secretary Walter Broadnax for a most successful gathering. They would like to commend Senator Carol Moseley-Braun for her efforts in putting together this Federal Procurement Fair and Congressman Donald Payne as Chairman of